DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 481 SP 003 567

AUTHOR MAUL, RAY C.
TITLE ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION BY NCATE. A SURVEY OF OPINIONS COMMISSIONED BY THE COORDINATING BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION.
INSTITUTION AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.
PUB DATE DEC 69
NOTE 34P.
AVAILABLE FROM AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION, 1 DUPONT CIRCLE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 ($0.50)

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80
DESCRIPTORS *ACCREDITATION (INSTITUTIONS), ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, *TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHERS COLLEGES

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE THE ATTITUDES OF INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING THE EFFORTS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (NCATE). EXPRESSION REGARDING NCATE POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND STANDARDS WERE SOUGHT IN QUESTIONNAIRES ADDRESSED IN APRIL 1969 TO THE 149 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WHICH HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THE NCATE ACCREDITATION OR REACCREDITATION PROCESS SINCE THE ADOPTION OF A REVISED CONSTITUTION IN 1965. OF THE 149, 21 ARE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES (90.5 PERCENT REPLYING), 17 PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES, (70.6 PERCENT REPLYING), 56 PUBLIC COLLEGES (85.7 PERCENT REPLYING), AND 55 PRIVATE COLLEGES (83.6 PERCENT REPLYING). IN EACH OF THE 120 REPORTING INSTITUTIONS (IN 41 STATES) THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER COMPLETED A 16-ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE, AND THE PRINCIPAL EDUCATION OFFICER COMPLETED A FIVE-PART, 38-ITEM INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE OPINION ON THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT, THE VISITING TEAM, THE VISITATION AND APPRAISAL COMMITTEE, THE COUNCIL, AND GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. (BRIEF SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE FINDINGS IS FOLLOWED BY DATA TABLES PRESENTING (1) INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS, E.G., ACCREDITATION STATUS AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH NCATE, (2) NUMBER AND PERCENT OF "YES" AND "NO" ANSWERS AND COMMENTS ON EACH ITEM, (3) PERCENT OF "YES" RESPONSES FOR EACH TYPE OF INSTITUTION, (4) REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS FOR EACH QUESTION.) (JS)

ED036481

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION BY NCATE

A Survey of Opinions Commissioned by the Coordinating Board of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

By RAY C. MAUL

April 1969

Published December 1969
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., 20036

SP003567

Foreword

Over the past decade no issues in the accreditation of colleges and universities have been more frequently discussed than those related to the accreditation of teacher education. In 1963 the National Commission on Accrediting, working toward a search for a socially sound resolution to these issues, sponsored the *Study of the Influence on Higher Education of Accreditation in Teacher Education*. The report on this study, authored by John R. Mayor, was published in 1965.

One of the major contributions of the study mentioned above was the comprehensive inventory of the effects of accreditation in teacher education along with the delineation of the complex interrelations among the educational, professional, and governmental interests concerned with teacher education. As a result of the study a number of changes were made in operational aspects of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). After four years of experience with these new directions of NCATE, it seemed highly desirable that a survey be made to determine the attitudes of institutional representatives to the efforts of this accrediting agency for teacher education. Working in conjunction with the National Commission on Accrediting, the NCATE Coordinating Board secured the services of Dr. Ray Maul to conduct such a study. The chief administrative officers of a representative group of institutions and also the individuals responsible for the direction of the teacher education programs in these colleges and universities were contacted by Dr. Maul. Expressions regarding their experiences with the NCATE policies, procedures, and standards were sought and received. The resulting summary of this survey is being made available to all of those interested in this subject through the generosity of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, one of the constituent members of the Board.

The survey comes at a most appropriate time, for NCATE now has under consideration new standards that have been recommended by the Executive Committee of AACTE. Certainly the points of view of those most directly affected by the accrediting activities, namely the institutions of higher education, should be of real benefit to NCATE and the total teacher education community. In making available these findings, the National Commission on Accrediting wishes to express its appreciation to Dr. Maul, to the NCATE Coordinating Board, to AACTE, to the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, and to the host of individuals from the various institutions who contributed so generously of their time to make this study possible.

Frank G. Dickey
Executive Director
National Commission on Accrediting

December 1969

Table of Contents

		Page
FOREWORD		
	Frank A. Dickey, Executive Director, National Commission on Accrediting	ii
PART I -	Chief Administrative Officers	2
PART II -	Principal Education Officers	4
PART III -	Survey of Opinions Regarding Accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education .	6
Table 1:	Accreditation Status of 149 Institutions	6
Table 2:	Title of the 108 Officers Signing for the Chief Administrator	7
Table 3:	Responses of Chief Administrative Officers	9
Table 4:	Percent "Yes" Response of 101 Administrative Officers and of Those in Each Stratum	12
Table 5:	Comparison of "Yes" Responses of 101 Administrative Officers with the "Yes" Responses of Those 29 Who Were Members of the Council, V & A, or Visiting Team, or Consultant	13
Table 6:	Total Number of Comments by 81 Administrative Officers on Each Question	14
Table 7:	Representative Comments by 81 Administrative Officers .	15
Table 8:	Percent "Yes" Responses of 108 Principal Education Officers	23
Table 9:	Responses of Principal Education Officers	26

A SURVEY OF OPINIONS COMMISSIONED BY THE COORDINATING BOARD
OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

On April 14, 1969 the National Commission on Accrediting addressed a two-part questionnaire to the 149 colleges and universities which have participated in the NCATE accreditation or reaccreditation process since the adoption of a revised constitution in 1965. Of these, seventeen participated in the fall of 1966; thirty-four in the spring of 1967; twenty-seven in the fall of 1967; twenty-nine in the spring of 1968; fourteen in the fall of 1968; and twenty-eight in the spring of 1969. None of this latter group of twenty-eight had yet received notice of the final action of the Council, and thus several did not undertake to answer the four questions concerned with the makeup and actions of the Council.

Of the 149 institutions addressed, twenty-one are public universities of which nineteen, or 90.5 percent, replied; seventeen are private universities, of which twelve, or 70.6 percent, replied; fifty-six are public colleges, of which forty-eight, or 85.7 percent, replied; and fifty-five are private colleges, of which forty-six, or 83.6 percent, replied.

Of the 125 reporting institutions, seventy-seven, or 61.6 percent, are fully accredited; forty-one, or 32.8 percent, are accredited but with some provision or limitation, and three were denied accreditation. Of those fully accredited, ten are public universities; nine are private universities; thirty-two are public colleges; and twenty-six are private colleges. Of those with some provision or limitation, eight are public universities; three are private universities; thirteen are public colleges; and seventeen are private colleges. (See TABLE 1) Final Council action (in the fall of 1969) will determine the accreditation status of those twenty-eight participating in the accreditation process in the spring of 1969.

Geographically, the survey included one or more institutions in each of forty-one states: all except Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, Rhode Island, and South Carolina plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

In addressing the institutions, Dr. Frank Dickey, Executive Director of the National Commission on Accrediting, asked the president, or a general administrative officer he designated, to complete a two-page questionnaire consisting of sixteen questions. The president was also asked to pass along a four-page questionnaire to the principal education officer who had major responsibility for preparing the institutional report and making arrangements for the work of the visiting committee. This four-page instrument, consisting

of five sections and a total of thirty-eight questions, was returned to the office of the president, and both were then mailed together to the Washington office of the National Commission on Accrediting.

PART I - CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

In examining the responses of chief administrative officers it should be noted that some of the data were tabulated in time to present to the May 22-23 meeting of the Coordinating Board, while other data coming from the final tabulations include a small number of additional responses received later. Each of the following tables indicates the number of institutions included.

In forty-nine of 108 responses the president was the administrative officer who signed the report; twelve were from vice presidents for academic affairs; seven each were from vice presidents, academic deans, or deans of the college. The specific titles of the other reporting administrative officers are shown in TABLE 2.

TABLE 3 presents a detailed analysis of the responses of 117 chief administrative officers (78.5 percent of the 149 addressed). Column 2 shows the number of affirmative answers and their percent of the total. Column 3 shows the negatives and, where significant, their percent of the total. Column 4 shows the number who offered some comment but did not check either "yes" or "no," while Column 5 shows that almost every one of the sixteen questions led to a reaction by the responding officers.

Without doubt, the administrative officers in the institutions evaluated under the standards adopted in 1965 feel confident that the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education is making a substantial impact upon the teacher education process as it goes forward in all types of institutions throughout the United States. The questions, designed to provoke evaluative judgments by officers working under the aegis of a wide variety of accrediting groups, both regional and special field, drew affirmative answers by overwhelming percents. In broad terms, seventy-five percent say NCATE procedures compare favorably or on a par with the regional associations, while sixty-seven percent say so with respect to the wide range of procedures practiced by the special field associations. NCATE visiting teams rate even higher in comparative competence, eighty-six and seventy-six percent respectively.

As many as eighty-five percent of the administrative officers recognized that participation in the successive steps of the entire procedure points up both the strengths and weaknesses of the institution's teacher education program, while eighty-four percent said this participation led to the clarification of institutional needs which must be described and defended before the institution's sources of support.

In regard to the level of effectiveness of NCATE accreditation procedures of today as compared with those of five years ago, sixty-four percent noted

improvement, while twenty-nine percent commented that they did not have the earlier experience on which to base a valid judgment. It is particularly noted that numerous respondents were not occupying their present positions five years ago.

Only question 16 seemed to lack uniform interpretation by the respondents. In some instances it was interpreted as inferring that graduate programs might receive more emphasis at the expense of the undergraduate programs. There was little or no indication of enthusiasm for a lessening of a sharp focus of accreditation upon the undergraduate teacher education programs.

No less than seventy-nine percent of the administrative officers felt that the total time and effort required by the successive steps of the accreditation procedure yielded justifiable institutional values. Just seventeen percent viewed this action negatively.

TABLE 4 provides the percent of affirmative answers by administrative officers to each of the sixteen questions, together with the percents by the officers of each of the four types of institutions. This table would seem to indicate that the overall evaluation of the NCATE process is not appreciably influenced by the type of institution served by the responding administrative officer.

In the original tabulation of 101 administrative officer responses, twenty-nine respondents had served on one or more of these: the NCATE Council, a V & A Committee, a visiting team, or as a consultant. It might be supposed that such experience or experiences would lead a respondent to a more favorable attitude toward the accreditation procedures. TABLE 5 shows, however, that this is not the case. The percents of affirmative answers of the twenty-nine balance with those of the 101, of which they are a part. Only on question 16 do those who have served in one or more of the committees and teams seem to have a fuller understanding.

All of the preceding paragraphs are based largely on the "yes" and "no" answers of administrative officers, although provision was made in the questionnaire for brief comments on each question. The first eighty-one questionnaires received were examined in some detail in order to prepare a representative list of comments for review by the Coordinating Board on the dates already mentioned. Some comments are with "yes" or "no" answers, and some are offered without answers. The number of comments on each question, in total and separately by each type of institution, is shown in TABLE 6. To include every one of the comments would be beyond the scope of this report, and thus those included in TABLE 7 are offered as being, in broad terms, representative of all.

In TABLE 7 each comment is identified as accompanying a "yes" or "no" answer, or with no answer. The type of institution served by the administrator offering the comment is also identified. There seems to be no series of comments peculiarly characteristic of any one of the four types of institutions.

Many of the comments are routine, only amplifying a positive or negative answer. A considerable number, however, tend to modify, or in some way limit, the accompanying positive answers or to give reasons for negative answers. It is these which have been quoted in TABLE 7, in the thought that they will contribute to the unending effort to improve and strengthen the entire NCATE structure and thus provide enlarged channels for its ever-growing role in the evolution of teacher education in all its phases, from pre-kindergarten to the most advanced level of graduate and post-doctoral study.

PART II - PRINCIPAL EDUCATION OFFICERS

Common practice in the institutions undergoing accreditation procedures pointed to there being one staff officer, usually the principal officer in the department, college, or school of education, who assumed general leadership in the successive steps, particularly the preparation of the institutional report and the general overseeing of the schedule and activities of the visiting team. Usually also, this staff member was most likely to be in contact with the NCATE office, and to conduct such relations with the V & A Committee as seemed appropriate. It was Dr. Dickey's request that the more extended questionnaire be referred by the president to this staff member, recognizing, of course, that he may no longer be available in a few instances. The 125 more detailed responses reported in TABLE 9 thus constitute a fuller analysis of the accreditation procedures than do Part I and the accompanying six tables.

The first of the five sections in TABLE 8 is concerned with the institutional report prepared prior to the arrival of the visiting team. Its adequacy in instructions for the preparation of the institutional report is supported by ninety-four percent of the respondents. Only seven of the 125 requested NCATE staff assistance and, of those, only one felt that it was not forthcoming.

As many as ninety percent of the respondents said the preparation of this report tended to bring the appropriate academic departments into closer cooperation with the education department (school, college) and to extend a recognition of the importance of teacher education. The worth of this report, in time and effort, was supported by eighty-five percent of the respondents. In response to perhaps the single most important question in the survey, just over one-fourth of the respondents (twenty-eight percent) considered it likely that such a comprehensive self-analysis would have been undertaken without NCATE impetus.

In the second section, ninety-three percent of the respondents commended the manner of selecting the visiting teams. Only twelve thought the team consisted of too many members; only three, too few. None considered the team's visit too long; only nine, too brief. About one-fourth felt that sometimes the team's attitude was of a somewhat inspectorial nature.

Most important in this section, perhaps, is the attitude of the respondents in regard to the function of the team. Sixty-one percent felt that this most

intimately related group (the team vis-a-vis the V & A committee, and the Council) should not have been limited to reporting facts, but should also have been called upon to make judgments; seventy-seven percent said the team should have been free to offer interpretations and recommend action to the V & A Committee and Council. Comments in support of this point of view are perhaps more extended, and more vigorous, than on any other question.

In the third section a feeling of the aloofness of the V & A Committee begins to become apparent, more in the comments than in the direct answers. Almost thirty percent of the respondents showed lack of readiness to characterize the V & A Committee as being adequately representative of the many and varied interests and problems of teacher education. Eighty-three percent of the 125 reporting institutions sent a representative to meet with the Committee, and sixty-nine percent of these representatives felt that the Committee showed adequate understanding of the institution's report. (Numerous comments hark back to the plea for more latitude in the visiting team's function.) Just seventy percent saw justification for a V & A Committee between the visiting team and the Council, while just forty percent felt that this Committee might appropriately be charged with making the final accreditation decision.

In the fifth section, eighty-eight percent agreed that the Council membership appropriately represents the various professional associations concerned with teacher education, and eighty-seven percent feel that this is true with respect to its representation of the higher institutions. Only seventy percent, however, feel confident that the Council reflects a mature grasp and professional understanding of the teacher education problems in their respective types of institutions.

The final section pointed up the respondents' recognition of the NCATE accreditation procedures stimulating improvement in teacher education, strengthening the relation of the education department (college, school) with the academic departments of the institution, extending relations with other institutions engaged in teacher preparation, and helping clarify and describe institutional needs for presentation to their sources of support. Only four of 123 respondents favored the freedom of control of the teacher education function by the individual institution itself.

PART III: SURVEY OF OPINIONS REGARDING ACCREDITATION BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

TABLE 1: Accreditation Status of 149 Institutions *

1	2	3	4	5	6
Status	Total	Stratum I	Stratum II	Stratum III	Stratum IV
Full Accreditation	77	10	9	32	26
Provisional	41	8	3	13	17
In Process	28	5	2	9	12
Denied	3	--	1	1	1
Total	149	23	15	55	56

*The twenty-eight institutions visited in the spring of 1969 will be considered by the Council at the coming summer and fall meetings, at which time decisions will be made and the institutions promptly notified.

TABLE 2: Title of the 108 Officers Signing for the Chief Administrator

1	2	3	4	5	6
Title	Total	Stratum I *	Stratum II	Stratum III	Stratum IV
President	49	3	5	23	18
VP for Academic Affairs	12	4	1	5	2
Academic Dean	7				7
Dean of the College	7			5	2
Dean	5			2	3
Dean of Instruction	3			2	1
Dean of Faculty for Academic Affairs	2			1	1
Dean of Academic Affairs	2			2	
Acting President	7				7
Vice Chancellor	1	1			
Dean of Faculties	1	1			
VP for Instruction	1			1	
Dean, Graduate School	1		1		
Exec Asst to President	2		1	1	
Exec VP and Provost	1	1			
Dean of Arts and Sciences	1		1		
VP and Dean	1				1
Dean of Liberal Arts	1				1
Provost for Instruction	1	1			
Acting Dean	1				1
Director of Instruction	1	1			

* See definitions on Page 8

(Continued)

TABLE 2 (Concluded)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Title	Total	Stratum I	Stratum II	Stratum III	Stratum IV
Not Indicated	1		1		
	108	12	10	42	44

Stratum I: Public Universities

Stratum II: Private Universities

Stratum III: Public Colleges

Stratum IV: Private Colleges

TABLE 3: Responses of Chief Administrative Officers
(117, or 78.5% of 149)

My Experience with NCATE: (check as appropriate)

Members of the Council	4
Members of the V & A Committee	5
Members of a Visiting Team	30
Consultant	5

1 Question	2 Yes	3 No	4 Comment Only	5 Total Answers
1. NCATE accreditation procedures harmonize generally with the teacher education problems and programs of colleges-universities.	110 94%	7		117
2. We consider the NCATE accreditation to be a meaningful indication of quality in a teacher education program.	103 88%	12 10%	2	117
3. The successive steps in the NCATE process, i.e., (1) the institutional report, (2) the team visitation, (3) the V & A review (with appropriate representation of the institution before the V & A Committee, if requested) and (4) the decision of the Council, result in an efficient approach to accreditation.	90 77%	22	5 19%	117
4. The experience of participation in these successive steps points up both the strengths and weaknesses of teacher education programs.	99 85%	12 10%	6	117
5. The experience of participation in these successive steps helps to clarify certain institutional needs and is useful as we prepare to present them to our sources of support.	97 84%	15 13%	3	115
6. Throughout the procedures (from application to final Council action) communication between the institution and NCATE was of generally satisfactory nature.	108 93%	8		116

TABLE 3 (Continued)

1 Question	2 Yes	3 No	4 Comment Only	5 Total Answers
7. The visiting team members were perceptive to the institution's interpretation of its role in teacher education.	110 94%	7		117
8. The NCATE team was about right in number 91; too many 23; too few 1.	91 79%	24 21%		115
9. The time and efforts required to prepare the institutional report and work with the visiting team were, in broad terms, justified by the institutional values derived.	91 79%	19 17%	6	116
10. In broad terms, the NCATE accreditation procedures (from application to final action by the Council) compare favorably 55; on a par 32; unfavorably 26; with the accreditation procedures of the regional association.	87 75%	26 22%	3	116
11. In broad terms, the NCATE accreditation procedures (from application to final action by the Council) compare favorably 48; on a par 26; unfavorably 11; with the accreditation procedures of the special field agencies visiting us within the past five years.	74 67%	11 10%	26 23%	111
12. From the standpoint of competence as evaluators, the NCATE team compared favorably 63; on a par 37; unfavorably 12; with the regional association examiners visiting us within the past five years.	100 86%	12 10%	4	116
13. From the standpoint of competence as evaluators, the NCATE team compared favorably 50; on a par 34; unfavorably 5; with other special field agencies visiting us within the past five years.	84 76%	5	22 19%	111

TABLE 3 (Concluded)

1 Question	2 Yes	3 No	4 Comment Only	5 Total Answers
14. Based on our experience and/or observations, we feel that the accreditation of teacher education programs by NCATE is at a higher level of effectiveness today than five years ago.	72 64%	8	33 29%	113
15. The present categories of NCATE accreditation (a) elementary school teaching, (b) secondary school teaching, and (c) school service personnel programs, are appropriate.	100 87%	7	8	115
16. Looking to the future, more emphasis (in the NCATE accreditation process) should focus upon the programs of graduate education.	47 41%	50 44%	17 15%	114

TABLE 4: Percent "Yes" Response of 101 Administrative Officers and of Those in Each Stratum

Question*	Total (101)	Stratum I** (12)	Stratum II (9)	Stratum III (42)	Stratum IV
1	94%	100%	89%	95%	92%
2	90	100	78	88	92
3	76	92	78	71	76
4	86	83	89	83	89
5	84	92	78	81	86
6	93	100	89	90	95
7	95	100	89	95	95
8	82	90	78	83	79
9	80	64	78	88	81
10	77	92	78	74	74
11	69	92	78	63	66
12	88	92	78	90	84
13	80	91	78	80	78
14	64	67	11	78	60
15	88	75	89	90	90
16	40	50	44	40	35

* See survey items on pages 9-11

** Stratum I: Public Universities

Stratum II: Private Universities

Stratum III: Public Colleges

Stratum IV: Private Colleges

TABLE 5: Comparison of "Yes" Responses of 101 Administrative Officers with the "Yes" Responses of Those 29 Who Were Members of the Council, V & A, or Visiting Team, or Consultant

Question *	Percent "Yes" by All 101	29 Only
1	94%	97%
2	90	93
3	76	73
4	86	86
5	84	83
6	93	90
7	95	100
8	82	78
9	80	83
10	77	79
11	69	65
12	88	90
13	80	76
14	64	69
15	88	89
16	40	28

* See survey items on pages 9-11

TABLE 6: Total Number of Comments by 81 Administrative Officers on Each Question

Question *	Total	Stratum I	Stratum II	Stratum III	Stratum IV
1	21	1	6	6	8
2	33	1	5	14	13
3	35	5	3	11	16
4	32	3	5	11	13
5	23	3	4	10	6
6	24	1	2	9	12
7	31	4	6	9	12
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	31	6	6	9	10
10	36	3	6	13	14
11	23	4	1	9	9
12	24	2	3	8	11
13	18	2	2	7	7
14	39	5	7	12	15
15	20	4	3	8	5
16	40	6	6	17	11

* See survey items on pages 9-11

TABLE 7: Representative Comments by 81 Chief Administrative Officers

Question Number 1.

Believe too much emphasis placed on "Professional Education."	Y.I. *
The procedures probably fit undergraduate better than graduate programs.	Y.II.
Members of visiting team did not seem to be familiar with the (name of state) situation.	Y.II
NCATE is aware of the importance of PR with institutions.	Y.III.
Teacher Education and Liberal Arts programs could be improved by joint visitations of NCATE and, for example North Central Association.	Y.IV.
Great detail and overlapping procedures required for NCATE report.	Y.IV.
Too much concern with trivialities.	Y.IV.
Time to meet NCATE, State Department, general college, and major discipline requirements is next to impossible.	Y.IV.
Procedures and standards lag behind changes in public education and teacher education programs.	Y.IV.
Evident bewilderment and/or ignorance of a sound program.	N.II.
Emphasis on procedure rather than on product.	N.III.
Too much standardization.	N.III.
They tend to stress "the Establishment."	N.III
Not sufficiently concerned with subject matter.	N.IV.

Question Number 2.

Somewhat more complicated than necessary.	Y.I.
We are grateful that there is a reputable national accreditation agency.	Y.II.
The opportunity to review programs with visitors seems healthy.	Y.II.
Perhaps more indication of strengths and weaknesses should be given.	Y.II.
The new NCATE standards will facilitate this area in greater depth.	Y.III.
Most criteria are quantitative in nature.	Y.III.
Stands high among accreditation endeavors.	Y.III.
Should be more provision for experimental programs.	Y.IV.

(Continued)

---

* (Y) The question was answered "Yes"

(N) The question was answered "No"

(NA) The question was not answered

I. denotes public university; II. denotes private university; III. denotes public college; IV. denotes private college.

TABLE 7 (Continued)

More variation from a single norm should be permitted.	Y.IV.
Their standards are high and, once met, command respect.	Y.IV.
Above a certain minimal level.	Y.IV.
Somewhat oriented toward traditional teacher education.	Y.IV.
The new NCATE standards will facilitate this area in greater depth.	Y.III.
Probably yes for Marginal programs.	NA.II.
Guidelines furnished by NCATE were vague.	N.II.
Existence of inferior but accredited programs.	N.III.
Good teachers are people, not programs.	N.III.
On balance, more is gained than lost by NCATE accreditation, but it is not a reliable measure of quality.	N.III.
Except for quantitative measures it does not really stress quality.	N.III.

Question Number 3.

Believe report and visitation can be simplified.	Y.I.
There is always danger that formal requirements may not allow sufficient flexibility for institutional differences.	Y.I.
This experience leads me to believe this is a most effective approach to accreditation.	Y.II.
Need for the third step is questioned.	Y.II.
More weight should be given to visiting team report.	Y.III.
Need a training program for visiting team members.	Y.III.
V & A committee seems unnecessary.	Y.III.
V & A review could be structured differently.	Y.IV.
V & A committee not necessary; visiting team should report directly to Council.	Y.IV.
The progression was smooth, orderly, well planned, and effective.	Y.IV.
Not altogether convinced that steps three and four are necessary.	Y.IV.
The time lag, and change in people involved between steps two and four are negative factors.	Y.IV.
Helpful and efficient because definite steps were followed logically.	Y.IV.
Decision is made by group having least information about institution.	N.I.
Effective and meaningful communication between these groups is lacking.	N.II.
Our experience is that V & A committee did not do its homework.	N.III.
Not much relation between visiting team report and decision of Council.	N.III.
Seems like a lot of different people are involved.	NA.III.
Visiting team should make final recommendations.	N.III.

(Continued)

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Visiting team report not correctly interpreted by V & A committee.	N.III.
Time and money diverted to this activity is expensive luxury.	N.III.
Is mechanized and rigidly structured; exploration in depth by fewer persons preferred.	N.III.
V & A committee too busy, too remote, too prone to stereotype responses.	N.III.
Too many steps in procedure.	N.IV.
Have visiting team make more evaluation comment.	N.IV.
Should emulate regional and other accrediting procedures, i.e., by persons who helped form and enforce standards.	N.IV.

Question Number 4.

Procedure somewhat more elaborate than necessary.	Y.I.
The multiple opportunities for discussion help clarify the assessments.	Y.II.
Overall experience may indicate strengths and weaknesses, but official reports do not do so.	Y.II.
Resulted in positive advancement of our program.	Y.III.
Visiting team sometimes overlooks significant facts.	Y.III.
Emphasis seems to be on weaknesses only.	Y.III.
The V & A review failed to do this.	Y.IV.
Report was particularly helpful in pointing up both areas.	Y.IV.
Could be more valuable if visiting team had consultant role.	Y.IV.
Provides ample opportunity for self-evaluation - very effective.	Y.IV.
The sheer number (twenty) of visitors and their individual ignorance of functions and programs was instantly evident.	N.II.
The effectiveness of the process stops with the visiting team.	N.III.
Not really - a potential for reenforcing prejudices.	N.III.
They seldom look for strengths.	NA.III.
Overemphasizes library, buildings, and plant.	N.IV.
More effective with fewer steps.	N.IV.
Partly, but not conclusively.	N.IV.
Changes in standards and procedures would encourage this outcome.	NA.IV.
Too many steps; institution feels the Council is too far removed.	NA.IV.

Question Number 5.

Procedure is somewhat more elaborate than necessary.	Y.I.
Experience particularly helpful in promoting cooperation among schools and departments of the University.	Y.II.
Reveals soft spots of which we were unaware because of our proximity to them.	Y.II.

(Continued)

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Caused our faculty to review their programs and reflect on justified calls for support.	Y.III.
An outside evaluator is often more helpful than an internal suggestion.	Y.IV.
Committee visit is helpful in an objective way.	Y.IV.
Support does not seem to be affected.	N.II.
Lack of organization was evident.	N.II.
Our sources of support rely on regional accreditation.	N.II.
No relationship.	N.III.
We use regional, not NCATE, reports to justify requests for support.	N.III.
This may change, but our sources of support now rely on other data.	N.III.

Question Number 6.

Verbal report of visiting team before leaving may be inadequate.	Y.II.
Very cooperative in every phase.	Y.III.
NCATE is very responsive and helpful.	Y.III.
Five years ago the communication with the Council was poor; in 1967 it was good.	Y.IV.
Outstandingly satisfactory, in fact.	Y.IV.
But is hardly a democratic system.	Y.IV.
We found it impossible to obtain clarification of "undefined doubts and concerns" upon which the Council based provisional accreditation.	N.III.
We found it prescriptive, condescending.	N.III.
The visit to Washington yielded nothing.	N.III.
Council report contained questions we do not understand; Council report was opposite team report on some issues.	N.IV.

Question Number 7.

Some confusion, but the job was complex.	Y.I.
Naturally some variation in the philosophies of team members.	Y.I.
It would have been better not to have included the NCATE team visit with the Regional Accreditation Association's visit.	Y.II.
Visitation teams too largely made up of tax-supported institutions, lacking appreciation of problems of private universities.	Y.II.
This is the team which should make final recommendations; why should there be a V & A committee?	Y.III.
Some areas were not covered; others were given too much emphasis.	Y.III.
Some team members tended to judge the institution in terms of their own teacher indication program.	Y.IV.

(Continued)

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Entire team very concerned about getting a true picture.	Y.IV.
We particularly liked the recognition and appreciation of the innovative and unique phases of our program.	Y.IV.
This is a weak "yes" as NCATE methods tend toward professionalism, rather than full acceptance of the liberal arts ideals.	Y.IV.
True in general, but liberal arts colleges are sometimes suspect by visitors from teacher training institutions.	Y.IV.
Each followed his own bent.	N.III.
Most visitors had had little contact with M. A. T. programs such as ours.	N.IV.
It was evident that visiting team members resisted any participation of a cooperative arrangement with the other colleges of the University.	N.II.

Question Number 9.

Definitely a good experience for us.	Y.I.
This exercise is of great value and should be undertaken at regular intervals without accreditation in mind.	Y.I.
However, the University as a total institution was re-accredited by four regional visitors; NCATE insisted upon twenty examiners. Ridiculous!	Y.II.
Institutional values would be increased by explicit indications of strengths and weaknesses.	Y.II.
We believe a ten-year cycle is about right.	Y.III.
Very helpful and should be even greater with new standards.	Y.III.
Problem is to enlist all with vested interests to do their full share.	Y.III.
Instructions for preparing report need clarification.	Y.III.
Some parts of report too extensive; should use other reports such as N. C. A.	Y.IV.
Procedure was a most valuable professional experience.	Y.IV.
The preparation was a rich professional experience for the whole college.	Y.IV.
The effort was instrumental in remedying several weaknesses.	Y.IV.
Too much detail required; self-examination values could be achieved with much less effort.	N.I.
Too much busy work; two-thirds of the written report could have been oral.	N.I.
Believe they can be reduced and still be effective and meaningful.	NA.I.
A very time-consuming project.	N.II.
Report too involved, repetitive and nit-pickey.	N.III.
Assembling of information took an inordinate amount of time.	N.III.
Too much duplication of effort required in preparing report.	N.III.
Much of report not relevant - could be obtained from catalog.	N.III.

(Continued)

TABLE 7 (Continued)

If the same values could be obtained through regional accreditation, the time and effort would not be justified.	NA.IV.
Time demands were too great.	N.IV.

Question Number 10.

(For questions 10, 11, 12 and 13, the letter F denotes favorably; the letter P denotes par; the letter U denotes unfavorably.)

Thorough and well organized.	F.II.
Special team; detailed reporting; reviewed by V & A committee and Council. All superior steps.	F.II.
NCATE cuts through regional mythologies and deals with components of quality.	F.III.
I think NCATE is superior.	F.III.
NCATE more thoughtful; more precise.	F.IV.
NCATE genuinely interested in total college.	F.IV.
In some respects NCATE is more thorough.	F.IV.
In broad terms, they are similar.	P.II.
Too specific and detailed. Somewhat repetitious in statement of goals and objectives.	U.I.
NCATE is more cumbersome; a more voluminous report and larger visiting team.	U.II.
Regional pays more attention to people and programs.	U.III.
Deliberations of V & A committee seem to be an unnecessary step.	U.IV.
Regional team comes as consultant; NCATE comes as "inspector."	U.IV.
Regional more sympathetic to liberal arts ideals.	U.IV.
Regional makes more effective use of evaluating team.	U.IV.

Question Number 11.

Perhaps more thorough than other recent accreditation process.	F.I.
NCATE guidelines and instructions are more extensive.	F.III.
The information required and the procedures followed were least as pertinent as the others.	F.IV.
This university has experienced five re-accreditations in the past six years. NCATE has been most costly, least qualified professionally, least helpful, least communicative.	U.II.
NCATE is much more complicated.	U.IV.

Question Number 12.

Team members were well qualified and selected.	F.I

(Continued)

TABLE 7 (Continued)

NCATE seemed to go to considerable length to provide team members who had competencies in the fields for which we sought accreditation.	F.II.
The NCATE evaluators were better.	F.III.
Evaluators were not sidetracked by their own specialties.	F.IV.
The larger NCATE committee made desirable specialization possible.	F.III.
The senior officers of the University were and remain appalled at the low level of qualifications of the visitors.	U.II.
Team members seemed to be sharply limited in outlook, perspective, on the whole.	U.III.
North Central Association uses fewer but better qualified people in their evaluation.	U.III.
Need a pre-service training program for visiting teams.	U.III.

Question Number 13.

The NCATE evaluators were better.	F.III.

Question Number 14.

It is less quantitative and less limited in flexibility.	Y.III.
NCATE has made a definite effort to improve techniques and PR.	Y.III.
The process is much more complete at all stages than it was formerly.	Y.III.
This team takes a broader view than the one ten years ago.	Y.IV.
Has greater respect; people feel they are a part of it.	Y.IV.
Instruction and materials for our second evaluation seem better outlined.	Y.IV.
More genuine desire to understand and to be helpful.	Y.IV.
I know intimately the heroic efforts of Dr. Larson, but twenty years experience leads me to a regretful negative assessment.	N.II.
I feel that the Council has become more rigid, is not evaluating reasonable progress in well established institutions.	N.III.

Question Number 15.

Guidelines are better suited to undergraduate than to graduate programs.	Y.II.
Alternate structuring might be equally acceptable, or even preferable.	Y.III.
Further expansion should be controlled.	Y.III.
We believe higher education programs should be added.	Y.III.
Changes in state departments may necessitate changes in NCATE requirements.	Y.IV.

(Continued)

TABLE 7 (Concluded)

Such categories tend to freeze the approach to teacher education.	NA.I.
These categories do not fit developing programs, e.g., those for subject-matter specialists who work at all levels.	N.IV.

Question Number 16.

Increasing significance of graduate study would seem to warrant this.	Y.II.
This trend is well established.	Y.III.
From comments of our graduates in graduate schools, I think some programs are very weak.	Y.IV.
Except as they apply to teacher preparation.	N.I.
Undergraduate programs are more important to society and to the profession.	N.II.
Basic undergraduate education is the key to success.	N.III.
North Central Association should do this.	N.III.

TABLE 8: Percent "Yes" Responses of 108 Principal Education Officers

1	2	3	4	5	6
Question *	Total (108)	Stratum I (15)	Stratum II (10)	Stratum III (44)	Stratum IV (39)
A. 1	95%	100%	80%	93%	100%
2					
3					
4	98	100	90	98	100
5	89	67	80	98	90
6	84	67	60	86	94
7	27	40	60	21	21
B. 1	94	100	80	98	92
2	91	100	90	90	87
3	93	93	100	89	90
4	93	87	90	93	95
5a	97	100	80	100	97
b	93	100	70	95	95
c	90	93	80	84	97
d	31	36	45	35	22
e	25	29	33	18	31
f	41	29	11	14	56
6	98	100	80	100	100
7	80	73	60	80	87
8	31	20	40	43	21

* See survey items on pages 26-31

(Continued)

TABLE 8 (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Question	Total	Stratum I	Stratum II	Stratum III	Stratum IV
9	75	75	60	75	80
C. 1	74	73	70	70	79
2	84	73	80	79	95
3	69	79	70	61	72
	65	71	70	47	75
4	82	79	70	74	94
5	72	73	60	75	70
6	40	53	50	25	49
7	23	13	20	21	31
D. 1	91	100	100	83	94
2	89	100	100	90	81
3	70	80	60	70	68
4	76	87	70	72	78
E. 1	80	87	60	80	82
2	81	80	60	84	84
3	89	87	80	89	92
4	84	80	80	89	82
5	77	40	70	84	84

(Continued)

TABLE 8 (Concluded)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Question	Total	Stratum I	Stratum II	Stratum III	Stratum IV
6	87	87	80	89	87
7	84	74	70	90	85
8	22	27	30	20	21
9	3	7	--	2	3
10	78	93	70	81	72
11	54	60	80	52	53

TABLE 9: Responses of Principal Education Officers
(125, or 83.9% of 149)

My Experience of Respondents with NCATE: (check as appropriate)

Members of Council	4
Members of V & A Committee	9
Members of Visiting Team	50
Consultant	9

1	2	3	4	5
	Yes	No	Comment Only	Total Answers
A. The Institutional Report				
1. Were you adequately informed (through such items as Steps of Procedure, Guide, and/or Explanatory Materials) about the expected content and format of the required institutional report before you started to prepare it?	117 94%	7	1	125
2. If not, did you request assistance from the NCATE staff?	6	2		8
3. If you requested assistance, was it helpful?	4	1	1	6
4. Do you feel that, in the preparation of the institutional report, you received the professional cooperation (generally speaking) of the representatives of other departments (outside education) in your institution?	121 97%	4		125
5. Did the preparation of the institutional report tend to bring the involved departments of the institution into a fuller appreciation of the importance of accreditation of teacher education?	113 90%	8	4	125

(Continued)

TABLE 9 (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5
	Yes	No	Comment Only	Total Answers
6. Were the institutional values derived worth the time and staff effort required to prepare the report?	106 85%	17 14%	2	125
7. If the institution had not been involved in a teacher education accreditation procedure at all, is it likely that such a comprehensive self-analysis would have been undertaken in order to point to a meaningful strengthening of the teacher education programs?	35 28%	85 69%	4	124
B. The Visiting Team				
1. Do you feel that your role in reviewing and approving the selection of members of the visiting team was satisfactory?	116 93%	6	1	123
2. Was the number of members of the team (a) about right 110; (b) too many 12; (c) too few 3?	110 88%	15 12%		125
3. Did the team members come from an appropriate range of types of institutions? If not, what missing types should have been represented?_____	113 90%	11 9%	1	125
4. Was the duration of the visit (a) about right 116; (b) too long __; (c) too brief 9?	116 93%	9		125
5. Was the team:				
(a) Professional, insightful, and objective?	120	4		124
(b) Responsive, helpful?	114	9	1	124
(c) Sufficiently representative of all fields covered?	110	14		124

(Continued)

TABLE 9 (Continued)

1	2 Yes	3 No	4 Comment Only	5 Total Answers
(d) Generally good, but not fully competent?	32	45	9	86
(e) Contained one (or more) generally unqualified person(s)?	32	77	7	116
(f) Generally inspectorial in nature?	43	56	6	105
(g) Other_____				
6. During their visit, did the team members establish professional rapport with the faculty members involved?	122 98%	3		125
7. Did team members, from their varied experience in different types of institutions, contribute to your education staff members' fuller appreciation of the challenge ahead?	98 78%	19 15%	8	125
8. In your opinion, should visiting teams be limited to the reporting of facts, and not be called upon to make judgments?	41 33%	76 61%	8	125
9. In your opinion, should visiting teams offer interpretations and be free to recommend action to the V & A Committee and Council?	96 77%	21 17%	8	125
C. The Visitation and Appraisal Committee (V & A)				
1. Do you feel the V & A Committee that considered your report was broadly representative of the many widely varied interests and problems of teacher education?	88 71%	10 8%	26 21%	124
2. During the course of the (most recent, if more than one) appraisal of the institution by the V & A Committee, did representative(s) of the institution appear before the Committee?	103 83%	6	15 12%	124

(Continued)

TABLE 9 (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5
	Yes	No	Comment Only	Total Answers
3. If so, did the V & A Committee show familiarity with and understanding of the institutional report? The visiting team report?	82 69%	16 13%	21 18%	119
4. Did your representative(s) have opportunity to present information and views which were, in your opinion, pertinent to the decision(s) of the V & A Committee?	96 81%	4	18 15%	118
5. Do you feel that the V & A Committee fulfills a necessary role in studying the institutional and visiting team reports, being open to institutional representation, and making recommendations to the Council?	86 70%	18 15%	19 15%	123
6. Is the representativeness of the V & A Committee so broadly professional that the final decision on accreditation might appropriately rest in its hands?	49 40%	39 32%	34 28%	122
7. Is the role of the V & A Committee not necessary, i.e., should the visiting team report and recommend directly to the Council?	29 24%	63 52%	29 24%	121
D. <u>The Council</u>				
1. As now constituted, does the Council appropriately represent the various professional associations concerned with teacher education?	107 88%	5	9	121
2. As now constituted, does the Council appropriately represent the institutions of higher education engaged in teacher education?	106 87%	7	9	122

(Continued)

TABLE 9 (Continued)

1	2	3	4	5
	Yes	No	Comment Only	Total Answers
3. Do the decisions of the Council reflect a mature grasp and professional understanding of teacher education problems in your type of institution?	85 70%	19 15%	18 15%	122
4. Through the Appeals Board, is there adequate provision for an institution to question the final decision of the Council?	89 74%	4	28 23%	121
E. General Considerations				
1. The NCATE accreditation procedures -- all steps from institutional application to Council decision -- recognize experimentation and innovation, i.e., movement beyond just the compliance with standards.	97 79%	17 14%	9	123
2. The NCATE accreditation procedures -- all steps from institutional application to Council decision -- actively stimulate improvement in teacher education.	97 80%	18 15%	7	122
3. Participation in NCATE accreditation tends to strengthen the status of the school (department) of education within the institution.	110 89%	6	8	124
4. This participation tends to encourage closer cooperative efforts between the academic departments and the education departments.	106 85%	10 8%	8	124
5. This participation strengthens our relations with other institutions undergoing the same accreditation procedures.	93 76%	16 13%	14 11%	123

(Continued)

TABLE 9 (Concluded)

1	2	3	4	5
	Yes	No	Comment Only	Total Answers
6. This participation facilitates and helps us to clarify and describe problems and needs to our sources of support.	107 88%	9	6	122
7. NCATE accreditation is a meaningful indication of quality in a teacher education program.	103 84%	10 8%	10 8%	123
8. We believe that accreditation by the regional association might be sufficient assurance of the quality of the teacher education program.	29 24%	93 76%	1	123
9. Control of teacher education programs should be the function solely of each institution without accrediting by an interinstitutional agency.	4	116 94%	3	123
10. Based on our experience and/or observations, the NCATE accreditation procedures are at a higher level of effectiveness today than five years ago.	97 79%	5	20 16%	122
11. Looking to the future, more emphasis (in the NCATE accreditation process) should focus upon the programs of graduate education.	64 54%	31 26%	24 20%	119